APPENDIX I

Vol. 34, No. 7 February 14, 1975

REPORTS ON THE 85TH MEMBERSHIP MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
Chicago, Ill., January 18, 1975

The morning program of the 85th meeting of the Association of Research Libraries was moderated by incoming ARL President Richard De Gennaro, University of Pennsylvania, and was devoted to the future of card catalogs. Joseph A. Rosenthal, University of California, Berkeley, Chairman of the ARL Task Force on the Future of the Card Catalog, introduced the topic by briefly describing some of the factors that have contributed to the problem and its growing urgency in large research libraries. William J. Welsh, Library of Congress, followed with a review of the history of the problem at the Library of Congress where the difficulties began in 1897 because the new building lacked any provision for a public card catalog. Thus, over the years, expansion of the card catalog always had to be at the expense of space for readers. The possibility of closing all or part of the catalog was broached as early as 1925. It was revived in 1955 and again in the late 1960's, but none of these proposals gained wide support. The prospects for an automated catalog by the end of the 1970's suggest that there is a basis for planning the future of Library of Congress catalog control in a way that will at last resolve a problem that, in one form or another, has troubled the Library for nearly three-quarters of a century.

John C. Rather, Library of Congress, described the card catalog as a living organism which is subject to growth, change, and deterioration. The Library's major card catalogs have tripled in size in the last 30 years and will double in the next 20 years if allowed to grow unchecked. Change is the most serious problem of catalog management because cards are vulnerable to change as long as they exist. Five methods of effecting change are: revision of old entries, relocation of old entries without individual changes, superimposition, linked headings, and starting a new catalog. Evaluation of these methods in terms of compatibility with new rules, consistency of entries, dispersion of entries, and cost underscores the fact that there is no ideal method for coping with change.

The growing data base of MARC records and the development of a fully automated system for using them are new factors in the evolution of library catalogs. By 1980, it is expected that all current Library of Congress cataloging will go into MARC form. At the same time, the Library should have the capability to use this data base (then amounting to about 1.3 million records) with even greater flexibility than is now afforded by the card catalog. Given these conditions, it will no longer be fiscally justifiable to continue to maintain the card catalogs as a parallel system. When new entries are no longer being filed in the card catalogs, a determination will have to be made about the relationship between entries in the closed card catalog and those in the new MARC catalog. Three factors have an important bearing on the decision: (1) the impracticality of converting all of the 5.2 million nonMARC records which will then exist; (2) the desirability of developing a true on-line cataloging system within the Library; and (3) the importance of having complete authority files accessible to libraries that wish to contribute to a national bibliographic data base.

In view of these considerations, the most workable decision for cataloging purposes would be to regard the MARC data base as complete in itself so that only MARC entries would be considered in establishing new name and subject headings and in assigning new book numbers. Although the closed card catalog would still be the guide to vast holdings of the Library, it would only be a reference aid as far as cataloging operations were concerned. Careful planning would be necessary to ensure that this course of action would prove effective. It would, of course, have a major impact on libraries using Library of Congress cataloging data and each library would have to decide which of the five methods of effecting change should be adopted in its own situation.

Judith M. Corin, University of California, Los Angeles, described some of her library's day-to-day attempts to deal with actual and anticipated cataloging changes by the Library of Congress, particularly possible abandonment of the policy of superimposition and extensive alterations in subject headings. As an example of the pervasive effects of certain changes, she pointed out that a change in name heading can affect the cuttering of books which in turn affects access in an open-stack collection. Mrs. Corin stressed the value of a systematic approach to catalog

improvement and urged that there be more dialog between the Library of Congress and its users so that they can express their views and be fully informed about impending changes well in advance of their implementation.

Mr. Rosenthal discussed the long-range catalog planning efforts of the University of California library, which looks forward to having all current cataloging in machine-readable form, either as MARC records or local input, and to developing computer authority files for names, subjects, and series. Apart from any action by the Library of Congress, he cited three reasons for closing a university card catalog: (1) the cost of maintaining catalogs in their present form; (2) problems of distributing cataloging data to branch libraries; and (3) the possibility that a machine system would offer improved access to cataloging data. A key element in this planning relates to the fact that branch libraries often modify standard records and create local records to satisfy their own users.

Despite the attractiveness of uniform application of cataloging rules, Mr. Rosenthal argued that desuperimposition would be very costly unless it were tied to the closing of card catalogs. He emphasized the need for close collaboration between the Library and its constituents in planning for the future in this and other areas of concern such as providing name authority information in both manual and machine form, reexamining the structure of LC subject headings, and experimenting with alternative forms of catalogs.

The members of the reactor panel were in general agreement with the previous speakers. Paul Fasana, New York Public Library, described his library's experience since its card catalogs were closed in 1972 and supplanted by a machine-produced book catalog. There has been a substantial reduction in the cost of catalog management even though it has taken more than two years actually to complete the closing of the old catalogs. The preservation of the old catalog is a major concern but even the least ambitious method will be costly.

Hugh Atkinson, Ohio State University, presented the problem of the card catalog from the standpoint of his library's commitment to decentralization. Only by relying on remote on-line access to a machine file can the main library supply all of its branches (now numbering 22 and eventually 30 or more) with the cataloging information they need. Thus, a decision has been made to close the card catalog on July 4, 1976. Mr. Atkinson felt that the tradition of self-service at the catalog was unrealistic and that in an automated system most users would have to query the data base through a human intermediary.

Rutherford Rogers, Yale University, called the Library of Congress card catalog the greatest bibliographic instrument in the world, but he acknowledged that it will have to give way to a new form of catalog. Yale itself can no longer expect to expand its card catalog indefinitely. In planning for the future, libraries must prepare themselves for on-line computer systems and they must take advantage of the closing of the card catalog to solve long-standing problems relating to subject headings and transliteration.

Basil Stuart-Stubbs, University of British Columbia, said that his institution had decided to close its card catalog in the near future because of the cost and space it demands. Although he believed that computer-output microfilm (COM) might be an intermediate solution to making cataloging information generally available, he felt that it was not too far-fetched to imagine that libraries might be able to give up individual catalogs in favor of relying on a national data base.

Following the panel reactions, Mr. Welsh indicated that the Library of Congress is reconsidering the advisability of abandoning superimposition in the near term because of the reservations voiced by many large research libraries. It appears now that the change in this policy should be linked to the decision to close the present card catalogs.

In view of the interest in this topic, ARL is considering publishing the transcript of the presentations as a separate publication. [*John C. Rather*]

At the afternoon business meeting, reports were heard from the following five Commission Chairmen: Development of Resources, Gustave Harrer; Organization of Resources, William Budington; Access to Resources, Virginia Whitney; Management of Research Libraries, Stanley McElderry; and External Affairs, William Dix. Robert Downs, University of Illinois, gave an interim report on the work of the ARL-ACRL Joint Committee on University Library Standards; a final report will be presented in the future to the membership of ARL.

Lawrence Livingston, Council on Library Resources, gave a status report on the CONSER (CONversion of SERials) project. [His report appears as Appendix II to this issue of the LC *Information Bulletin;* background information on CONSER appeared in the LC *Information Bulletin* on February 1, 1974, pp. A-35–A-38, and November 29, 1974, pp. A-245–

A-248.] The general reaction to CONSER has been favorable. The contract with CLR and OCLC was signed in December and was described in the LC *Information Bulletin* of January 17, p. 18. Besides Mr. Livingston and George Parsons of the regular CLR staff, Richard Anable, on leave of absence from York University, is working on the CONSER project. Target dates call for the Library of Congress to begin authenticating records in May.

Elected to the Board of Directors for three-year terms were Richard W. Boss, University of Tennessee, Russell Shank, Smithsonian Institution, and Edward C. Lathem, Dartmouth College, and, elected to complete a two-year term resulting from a resignation was Page Ackerman, University of California, Los Angeles. Virginia Whitney, Rutgers University, was elected Vice President and President-elect.

The following resolution was unanimously approved by the membership:

WHEREAS, The Library of Congress has during the past twenty years made contributions of great significance in areas of concern to this Association, these having been accomplished during the administration of the recently retired Librarian of Congress, and

WHEREAS, such contributions include much enhanced development of resources through establishment of overseas procurement offices under Public Law 480 and the National Program of Acquisitions and Cataloging, and

WHEREAS, organization of resources in the Library of Congress and other libraries has been markedly aided by the Dewey Decimal Classification Office, Information Systems Office, the MARC programs, preservation activities and Cataloging-in-Publication, and

WHEREAS, access to resources has benefited by establishment of special area sections, the National Referral Center for Science and Technology, and special services to the blind and handicapped, and

WHEREAS, management of resources is greatly improved by automation of as many internal procedures as possible, the establishment of the Federal Library Committee, Equal Opportunity Office, and National Libraries Task Force, and now the construction of the long-awaited third building,

Therefore, be it RESOLVED, that the members of the Association of Research Libraries, here assembled, express to

L. QUINCY MUMFORD

their great respect and appreciation for his two decades of dedicated service as Librarian of Congress, requiring astute participation in many levels of governmental relationships, a perception of national public and professional needs, a cordial and mutually productive interaction with many professional and business communities and the fulfillment of high expectations in a long and meritorious career.

At the conclusion of the membership meeting, ARL members held a banquet and program in honor of retiring Executive Director Stephen A. McCarthy and his wife, Dorothy. Mr. McCarthy was presented an album containing letters of tribute from ARL members and library colleagues. [*John G. Lorenz*]

FOREIGN NEWSPAPERS ON MICROFILM

The ARL Standing Committee on Foreign Newspapers on Microfilm held an informal meeting on January 19. Members attending were John G. Lorenz, Acting Librarian of Congress, and Gordon R. Williams, Director of the Center for Research Libraries. Also present was John Y. Cole, Coordinator, Foreign Newspaper Microfilming, Reference Department, Library of Congress.

Mr. Williams presented a financial report on the ARL Foreign Newspaper Project for 1974, as well as a budget estimate for 1975. He noted that a report on 1974 project acquisitions was submitted in December. Several questions concerning project holdings were discussed. It was agreed to transfer the microfilm of the *Bangladesh Observer* (December 18, 1971+) from the Center for Research Libraries to the ARL project, which will place a subscription for future issues. CRL members will retain access for the period represented by the transfer. At the same time, ARL project subscribers will be granted access to the ARL file of the *Pakistan Observer* (1962-December 17, 1971).

Mr. Cole reported briefly about foreign newspaper activities at the Library of Congress, particularly the publication of the fourth edition of *Newspapers Received Currently in the Library of Congress* (1974) and the pending publication of *Newspapers in Microform 1973*. The latter will be the first annual supplement to the two-volume cumulation, *Newspapers in Microform: United States, 1948-1972*, and *Newspapers in Microform: Foreign Countries, 1948-1972*.

With regard to the microfilming of foreign gazettes, it was agreed to purchase for the ARL Foreign Official Gazette Project (FOGMP) those titles that would bring FOGMP holdings up to the point where the new Library of Congress/New York Public Library gazette filming project commences. This microfilm, covering roughly the years 1967-1969, will be purchased from the New York Public Library. A draft letter from the committee to FOGMP subscribers concerning the future of the project was discussed. Mr. Williams agreed

to expand the letter, explaining the committee's decision to terminate FOGMP and asking subscribers for a response on the use of whatever funds remain after the latest purchase. [*John Y. Cole*]

APPENDIX II

THE CONSER PROJECT: CURRENT STATUS AND PLANS

by Lawrence G. Livingston

[Editor's Note: The author, Program Officer of the Council on Library Resources, Inc., and Head of the CLR's Systems Group, delivered this paper to the 85th Membership Meeting of the Association of Research Libraries at Chicago on January 18.]

In January 1974, during the annual meeting of the Association of Research Libraries, the membership was asked to consider the concept of a composite effort to build an on-line national serials data base. The project came to be known as CONSER, for CONversion of SERials records. This resulted from a request by the Library of Congress and ARL to the effect that the Council on Library Resources should assume an interim role as manager of a project to pull together several already operating efforts to build a serials data base.

That concept was presented again at ALA Midwinter, which occurred the week after the ARL meeting, and copies of the paper were distributed there. In order to insure wider distribution, the paper was also published in the LC *Information Bulletin* on February 1, 1974.

The origins and justification for the CONSER project were covered in a paper by Richard Anable which appeared in the December 1973 issue of the *Journal of Library Automation.* An excellent update on these two papers was published by Lois Upham, University of Minnesota, in the November 29, 1974, issue of the LC *Information Bulletin.*

The justification for CONSER and the general approach decided upon have, then, received wide publicity. In general, the response has been favorable; most librarians seem to be gratified that CLR has taken on this responsibility. Lively discussions have been held on the subject and many legitimate and important questions have been raised. Not everyone agreed with every decision taken, however. It is the purpose of this presentation to relate what has happened with regard to CONSER since last January and to cite the major problems encountered, together with solutions or approaches to solutions decided upon, with a view to convincing you that CONSER is a project deserving of your fullest support.

As soon as the decision to go ahead with the CONSER project was firm, CLR began several actions, most critical of which were the contract negotiations with OCLC and the selection of the initial participants. In July, Richard Anable joined the CLR staff on a leave of absence from York University to work on the project. He and George Parsons of the regular staff now devote full time to CONSER.

By April of last year the decision to use OCLC was firm, and the first formal discussions with them to that end occurred. The first drafts of the contract were exchanged between OCLC and CLR in May. It soon became evident that interests considered vital to both parties to the contract were at loggerheads. From the Council's point of view, participation in and support of the CONSER project could not be justified unless the resulting data base could be made available to the library community at nominal cost and with no restrictions as to use. From the OCLC point of view, participation in the construction of a data base which was to be made freely available amounted to giving unwarranted advantages to potential competitors, especially those in the commercial sector.

This legitimate concern on both sides was perhaps the most difficult point to negotiate, and very time consuming. In any event, the decision-makers at OCLC conceded this point, and the contract (which, incidentally, was finally signed on December 17, 1974) includes the provision that ownership and free distribution rights to the CONSER data base accrue to the Library of Congress and the National Library of Canada. Both have indicated that they are considering distributing CONSER records in some sort of

adjunct to the regular MARC distribution services.

The contract also specified that OCLC will retain full use and distribution rights to the CONSER file, to include the complete file at project's end. This was only right, and the obvious advantages to institutions participating in OCLC undoubtedly weighed heavily in the decision to accept that part of the contract. The contract further assures the CONSER participants access to their own records in the file.

OCLC agreed not to charge the project for the use of the system itself, which had been developed with some assistance from CLR. CLR agreed to pay OCLC for the secondary storage required by the CONSER records and their indexes. As some modifications to OCLC serials software would be required by CONSER, CLR agreed to pay for the staff time required to do the programming. The contract provides for certain other staff services required by CONSER to be performed by OCLC and paid for by the Council.

While the protracted contract negotiations were going on, the process of selecting the institutions to participate initially was begun. Several considerations were vital here, the two most important being bibliographic excellence in serials work and a willingness to contribute significant resources to the project. First choices were easy; the Library of Congress, National Library of Canada, (U.S.) National Library of Medicine, and National Agricultural Library were naturals for the project. Next came Yale, Cornell, University of California, University of Minnesota, and joint representation from the State University and State Library of New York. The national libraries in this country agreed to furnish all their own support, and agreement is near with each of the other participants, wherein each will furnish its own staff and in-house facilities and the project will supply varying amounts for terminals and communications.

The University of Minnesota deserves special mention here. On its own, Minnesota, through the MINITEX Program, had prepared a large file of serials records in machine-readable form. The Minnesota Union List of Serials, MULS as it is called, was considered the best large file available for use as a starting base for CONSER. Minnesota agreed to furnish the file, and it has already been delivered to OCLC. It will be merged first with LC MARC serial records, then with other OCLC serials records, and finally, with the Canadian MARC serials. The intent is to eliminate, to the degree that is possible, the duplicates among these files and then have the CONSER participants upgrade the records to the best possible level of completeness, excellence, and content designation.

The Library of Congress MARC format for serials will, of course, be used throughout. Where the latest version of that format does not provide for data elements or controls considered necessary for CONSER, for example, for the bilingual requirements of Canada or certain elements required by the International Serials Data System, recommendations for changes to the format are being worked out and submitted for consideration through the channels established for that purpose. The project will not establish any standards itself, and no data elements or controls will appear in records to be distributed which have not been officially approved.

Meanwhile, at the Library of Congress, CONSER planning was having an impact. It will be remembered that last January it was recommended that the Library of Congress study its own several serials processing flows and attempt to reconcile them better with each other and with what was to become CONSER. This has now been done, and it is evident that the Library is fully committed and prepared to make a major contribution to CONSER. Throughout this planning year, the Library has been closely involved in the CONSER planning, and the attitude there for cooperation, compromise, and change could not have been better.

No decision on the bibliographic aspects of CONSER has been taken without exhaustive analysis of the problem by librarians well qualified in serials work. As has already been mentioned, Richard Anable is assigned full time to CONSER. So is George Parsons, who has worked on the machine-processing of serial records at the national level consistently since 1968. The Council has continued to convene the "Toronto Group"[1] and its various subcommittees as required. To consider the broader management aspects of CONSER and its proper relationship to the abstracting and indexing community, an Advisory Group [see Attachment 1] has been appointed. It has met twice in the last year. In addition, the initial participants in CONSER have been represented in the deliberations; a list of those who met [see Attachment 2] on December 11-12, 1974, with the Advisory Group shows some overlap with the two other groups just mentioned. During that meeting several opportunities were given all conferees to make any comment, criticism, or recommendation concerning CONSER they desired.

[1] For the names of the members of the Toronto Group, see the Library of Congress *Information Bulletin*, February 1, 1974, pp. A-37–A-38.

Now to turn to the most difficult parts of all of this—those decisions affecting the bibliographic aspects of CONSER. First let's examine the proposition that the entire universe of serials should be recataloged consistently by the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules* (AACR) before they are entered into any national machine-readable data base. On the theoretical level, this is obviously the best solution. In the real world, several sets of circumstances mitigate against its selection. In the first place, the resources that would be required to do the recataloging job at one place are just not available. Even if all serials had been cataloged exactly according to AACR, they would require significant update almost at once because the rules themselves are changing, and the International Serials Data System (ISDS) Guidelines and the International Standard Bibliographic Description for Serials (ISBD(S)) will undoubtedly require further change. A change in the rule for the choice of main cataloging entry for serials is even now under serious discussion.

All of this argues very strongly for the most flexible system for serials that can be devised, and if the data base is going to be built in the short term, a division of labor in its construction is needed to take advantage of catalogers and cataloging in many places. This is exacly what CONSER is all about.

It has been suggested that the whole idea of building a comprehensive data base in two years amounts to precipitous action. It has also been said that CONSER should not begin until the rules are settled and much more consistency in local cataloging is available. Considering the fact that Phase I of the National Serials Data Program began in 1967 and we are no further along than we are, it is very difficult to agree with this position. There is something of a chicken-and-egg situation here; a project like CONSER can't succeed without a high degree of consistency and standardization in serials cataloging in many libraries, but something very much like CONSER is required before that degree of consistency and standardization can be attained.

In CONSER, the intent is to start with several data bases in the MARC serials format, as has been mentioned. The participating libraries have divided up the alphabet among themselves, each agreeing to begin at its assigned point, putting in the records of serials currently received. When each has exhausted its assigned portion of the alphabet, each will proceed through the alphabet, converting the remainder of its currently published serials holdings. The term "converting" here means either keyboarding an entire record or upgrading one already in the file. Note that, in the first effort, the entire emphasis is on live titles. After that, and as time and resources permit, each participant will return to the assigned segment of the alphabet to work on ceased publications.

Two very difficult decisions indeed had to be taken with regard to the way serials are entered in existing catalogs. If there is to be a division of labor, the participants must work from their existing catalogs, if the resulting file is going to be useful to them in the near term. Records in some of these catalogs were entered under at least two different sets of cataloging rules. Of special concern to CONSER planning were the matters of superimposed corporate headings and latest titles versus successive title entry. To oversimplify, superimposed corporate headings occur when a heading established prior to the adoption of the AACR was continued in the catalog as it was, as an exception to the rule, rather than being reestablished under the new rule. Similarly, the AACR and the ISDS Guidelines require the creation of a new serial record whenever a title changes, but some libraries for years lumped what should under the new rules be separate records, one per title, under the latest title under which the serial was published. These compromises with the rules were made mandatory by economic forces; it was not possible for very large libraries to go back and recatalog everything when the rules changed. The result is that the bulk of retrospective serial records are not cataloged under the successive entry principle, and many include superimposed headings.

The goal of the CONSER Project is a single file with a single set of rules consistently applied. This can only be the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules as these apply to serials. A clear need exists, however, to accommodate the requirements of the International Serials Data System and the ISBD(S). To illustrate: it would border on the irresponsible to build the CONSER file without providing for the Key Title of the ISDS. Key Title is not part of AACR; neither is the International Standard Serial Number. Both can be added to the CONSER record as they are available without doing violence to the record. That is the intent—to build a composite format which will accommodate the variations from the AACR that exist in the real world, while still providing records for distribution that comply with the rules completely.

In CONSER, the Library of Congress and the National Library of Canada continue to act as the final bibliographic authority. Both libraries will have the ability to call up CONSER records, compare them

with the official catalog, upgrade and/or authenticate certain data fields according to AACR and the ISDS Guidelines (for example, name fields, Key Title, and ISSN). When authentication has taken place, the system will preclude further alteration of the authenticated fields by anyone for any purpose except for the correction of errors under carefully controlled procedures. It is seen, then, that in CONSER the ultimate responsibility and authority for the records rests with the Library of Congress for all except Canadian imprints.

The decision to be made was clear: either build the file at a rate that would permit the prior bibliographic upgrading and verification of each record, or put bibliographically inconsistent records in at first and then work them over as time and the resources made available by the division of labor described above would permit. After much deliberation and consultation, especially with the Library of Congress, and with an overwhelming majority of the Advisory Group and representatives of participants agreeing, the second approach was chosen.

Several points need to be made here. The Library of Congress began cataloging serials by successive entry before serial records began to appear in the MARC Distribution Service. A decision has been taken to withhold MARC serial records from CONSER if they contain superimposed corporate headings. Taken together, this means that all current Library cataloging going into CONSER will be according to AACR. This is also true of the National Library of Medicine, National Agricultural Library, and the National Library of Canada. Retrospective records entered will, for the most part, require post-entry editing by the Centers of Responsibility. Libraries are encouraged to use the CONSER data base but certainly no library is *required* to use a CONSER record before it meets that library's standards for excellence.

It has been suggested that the CONSER file should not be built unless or until an authority file was designed and built. After careful consideration of the economic, time, and other factors involved, the flexibility of the OCLC system, and the Centers of Responsibility concept, a decision was made not to hold up file-building pending the availability of an authority file, but a machine-readable authority file is a firm requirement for the future. It is worth mentioning that a record whose name fields have been authenticated by one of the Centers of Responsibility can support some authority file functions.

The CONSER plan includes several levels of records. A minimum data element set (within the composite format mentioned earlier) has been defined, below which a record is considered incomplete. The goal, of course, is the most complete record possible, and participants are encouraged to input all available data. Only experience will tell what degree of completeness is possible for retrospective records. It seems to this writer that, given the use of the OCLC system capabilities and the many people who will be contributing to the file, a lot can be done.

That is about where CONSER is at the moment. This past year was taken up with contract negotiations, selection of the initial participants, and grappling with the problems outlined in this paper. Some things are not yet done. As this is being written a meeting on the holdings statement problem is going on at OCLC. The Agreed Upon Practices documents which will govern the day-to-day decisions of the participants is still undergoing discussion and revision. The recommendations for change to the MARC serials coming out of CONSER will be given wide publicity as soon as they have cleared the MARBI Committee.

Let me summarize by listing [see attachment 3] the dates on which the contract requires the signatory parties to exert their best effort to accomplish certain things. These dates are based on the date of execution of the agreement, which was December 17, 1974.

ATTACHMENT 1 – MEMBERS OF ADVISORY GROUP

The Library of Congress, William J. Welsh
The National Library of Medicine, Joseph Leiter
The National Agricultural Library, James Farley
The National Library of Canada, Hope Clement
The National Serials Data Program, Joseph Price
The National Federation of Abstracting and Indexing Services, J. R. Smith (BIOSIS), Philadelphia, Pa.; James L. Wood (CAS), Columbus, Ohio; Ben H. Weil (EXXON), Linden, N.J.; Betty Bryan (ASM), Metals Park, Ohio
The Association of Research Libraries, John McGowan, Northwestern University
The Federal Library Committee, James Riley
The American Library Association, Paul Fasana, New York Public Library
The ALA Committee on Machine Readable Bibliographic Information, Ruth Tighe, NELINET (present member);

Velma Veneziano, Northwestern University (past member)
The ALA Large Research Library Serials Discussion Group, Susan Brynteson, University of Tennessee
The Joint Committee on the Union List of Serials, Karl F. Heumann
The Ohio College Library Center, Fred Kilgour
The Special Library Association, Idris Smith, Kansas City Public Library
The State University of New York (SUNY), Glyn Evans
The Ad Hoc Discussion Group on Serials Data Bases (Toronto Group), Jay Cunningham, University of California in Berkeley

ATTACHMENT 2 – PARTICIPANTS IN THE DECEMBER 11-12, 1974, MEETING

Joseph Leiter, National Library of Medicine
Joseph Gantner, National Library of Medicine
Samuel Waters, National Agricultural Library
Richard Farley, National Agricultural Library
Van Judd, New York State Library
Idris Smith, Special Library Association
Paul Fasana, New York Public Library/ALA
Frederick G. Kilgour, OCLC
David Weisbrod, Yale University
Hope Clement, National Library of Canada
James Wood, Chemical Abstracts Service
John McGowan, Association of Research Libraries
Ryburn Ross, Cornell University
Betty Bryan, American Society for Metals
Jay Cunningham, Toronto Group
John Aubry, Five Associated University Libraries
Ralph Hopp, University of Minnesota
Lois Upham, University of Minnesota
Glyn Evans, State University of New York
Ben Weil, EXXON
Gail Bernhard, BIOSIS
William J. Welsh, Library of Congress
Joseph Price, NSDP/Library of Congress
Joseph Howard, Library of Congress
Lucia Rather, Library of Congress
Karl Heumann, Joint Committee on the Union List of Serials
Charles Husbands, Harvard University/MARBI
Susan Brynteson, ALA (LRLSDG)
James Riley, Federal Library Committee
Fred C. Cole, Council on Library Resources
Lawrence G. Livingston, Council on Library Resources
George A. Parsons, Council on Library Resources
Richard Anable, Council on Library Resources
Herman B. Fussler (observer), University of Chicago

ATTACHMENT 3 – CONTRACT TARGET DATES

(1) Delivery of MULS File to OCLC by CLR, December 28, 1974
(2) CONSER Participants order terminals, January 16, 1975
(3) Telephone lines ordered by OCLC and installed, March 17, 1975
(4) OCLC completes reprogramming of LC output, March 17, 1975
(5) LC tests output requirements, April 6, 1975
(6) Terminals installed, April 6, 1975
(7) OCLC completes loading of LC-MARC Serials, April 16, 1975
(8) OCLC completes loading of MULS file, April 16, 1975
(9) CLR completes scheduling of input of records by each CONSER Participant, April 16, 1975
(10) OCLC will complete programming for conversion, processing, and loading of, and will load, NLC CANMARC-S records as soon as possible after loading the MULS File
(11) LC begins authenticating records, May 16, 1975

APPENDIX III

Vol. 34, No. 7 February 14, 1975

REPORTS ON THE MIDWINTER MEETING OF THE AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION
Chicago, Ill., January 19-23, 1975

COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT OFFICERS

The Chief Collection Development Officers of Large Research Libraries discussion group met on Saturday evening, January 18, under the chairmanship of Norman Dudley, UCLA University Library. As usual, the agenda for the evening was a very full one, covering a variety of topics which are becoming more and more crucial to large research libraries in a period of fiscal austerity. A report on the progress of the national shelflist measurement project undertaken by the group was the first item on the agenda. This project is now in the second year up-date, and it will furnish, when the new figures are tabulated, important information concerning the concentration of subject collections in a representative number of research libraries and on the rate of growth of these collections. Still not completely resolved is the problem of bringing within the project those libraries whose collections are organized–and shelflisted–according to Dewey rather than the Library of Congress system. The problem of the status of this ad hoc discussion group within ALA, which had been discussed at other previous meetings, was again reviewed and it was now a matter of general consensus that a proposal should be forwarded to make this group officially part of the Resources and Technical Services Division. Of considerable interest to those present was also the current status of Richard Abel and Co., its fiscal problems, and the recent take over by the British firm Blackwell. Discussed at length also were the degree of duplication within research libraries in current acquisitions and the rapidly escalating cost of serial acquisitions. Exchange of information on the percentage of current acquisition budgets dedicated to the acquisition of serials was recommended; it is symptomatic that Berkeley, Columbia, Duke, and Washington universities, and the National Library of Medicine reported that their outlays for serial acquisitions are now exceeding those for monographs. Related to this last topic was the presentation by Gordon Williams on the expanded acquisition of journals at the Center for Research Libraries. It is Mr. Williams' position that the selection of serial titles to be added to the Center's collection should be tailored to the needs of member libraries and should include those serials that libraries must cancel due to their diminishing budgets. He admitted, however, that the number of cancellations and reports of such cancellations to the Center has been less than expected, amounting only to 1,200 during these past three years when at least 3,000 were expected. One explanation for this was thought to be the fact that many libraries have canceled marginal titles they could well do without, without bothering to notify the Center. Mr. Williams also reported on the frequent use made by the Center for Research Libraries of the lending facilities available to it from the Lending Division of the British Library. He also stated that the serial collection of the Center may grow in the next few years to a size of about 40,000 titles. [*John Charles Finzi*]

RTSD TECHNICAL SERVICES DIRECTORS OF LARGE RESEARCH LIBRARIES

The Committee met in morning and afternoon sessions on January 19. Most of the morning session was devoted to a shortened version of the Association of Research Libraries program on the future of card catalogs [see Appendix I to this issue of the LC *Information Bulletin*]. The participants in this rerun were William J. Welsh and John C. Rather, Library of Congress; Joseph A. Rosenthal, University of California, Berkeley; Judith M. Corin, University of California, Los Angeles; and Paul Fasana, New York Public Library. The morning session also included a progress report by John Byrum, Chairman of the CCR Committee on Anglo-American Cataloging Code revision.

In the afternoon, the group heard reports from the Library of Congress on the assignment of alternative Library of Congress class numbers for bibliographies now classed only in Z, progress on implementation of International Standard Bibliographic Description in relation to MARC records, and the incidence of incorrect International Standard Book Numbers in MARC records (only 2.5 percent from all sources). Other topics of reporting and discussion included a comparative study of procedures in cataloging with Library of Congress copy, the CONSER (CONversion of SERials) project, blanket orders, bibliographic control of state documents, the feasibility of developing standards for productivity in technical processing operations, and practices in microfilming card catalogs for security. [*John C. Rather*]

RTSD RESOURCES SECTION
LIBRARY MATERIALS DISCUSSION GROUP

The meeting provided a forum for a dialog between sales representatives and librarians on acquisition of serials in microform. Librarians agreed that the significant economic advantage of microforms is negated, in part, by persistent reader resistance. One librarian urged sales representatives to direct more of their efforts toward the consumer (for example, college and university faculties, rather than the librarians who serve as "middlemen"). Sales representatives responded to librarians' complaints of inadequate bibliographical access to microforms by asking to what extent libraries would be willing to pay for that control. One sales person estimated that the cost of providing adequate bibliographical control is equal to double the cost of acquiring and filming the original material. There is uncertainty among commercial firms as to the support the library market can, and will, provide for such expensive services. Several librarians noted that without those controls important collections of microforms were virtually inaccessible. Participants also discussed comparative advantages of microfiche versus reel film. Some librarians find less resistance among their readers to the fiche, perhaps because scanning is easier. Filing and retrieving may be a problem since a single fiche is much more easily misplaced than is a reel. Replacement costs, however, are obviously much less for fiche than for reels.

Policies with respect to lending film for home or office use vary, but there appeared to be a consensus that arbitrary distinctions between film and hard copy, with respect to borrowing privileges, serve no useful purpose.

In the latter part of the meeting, discussion turned to approval plans. Only one voice was raised in opposition to approval or "gathering" plans, characterizing such programs as abdication of professional responsibilities in selection and acquisitions. The majority of those present disagreed; they concurred, however, that approval plans cannot be regarded as the ultimate and final solution. Each library must carefully construct and monitor the profile of its requirements. Supplementary acquisition programs are essential. One librarian commented that whereas "approval plans are quick and dirty, title-by-title acquisition is slow and dirty!" [*Frank M. McGowan*]

BUDGET ASSEMBLY MEETING

The assembly, which is comprised of the vice presidents of divisions, chairmen of ALA committees, vice chairmen of round tables, and 10 members of the Council, met on January 19. The duties of the assembly are to review the budget submitted by the Committee on Program Evaluation and Support (COPES) and offer recommendations to the Committee. Elizabeth Fast, chairman of COPES, introduced the members of her committee and the ALA staff. Frank Sessa, Treasurer, presented the report for the fiscal year ending August 31, 1974. The budgetary process was reviewed by Jessie Carney Smith and Thomas Childers, COPES committee members, and Mrs. Fast presented the 1974-1975 budget estimates. Discussions followed with questions from the audience, answered by Mrs. Fast and Robert Wedgeworth, ALA Executive Director. There was great interest in the effect of the new dues structure and Mr. Wedgeworth reported on a study conducted by ALA to estimate 1975 membership under the new dues schedule. A sample of 1,244 personal members of ALA was selected and a questionnaire sent to each member in the sample. The 664 responses (approximately 53 percent of the sample) indicated a loss of members in ALA and in the divisions. [*Henriette D. Avram*]

RTSD COMPUTER FILING COMMITTEE

The committee met in two sessions during the morning and afternoon of January 20 to continue its efforts to develop standard rules that apply to all types of filing arrangement, whether alphabetical or systematic. The governing principle for this work is that elements of a field (for example, a heading, a title) should be taken in exactly the order and form in which they appear. In conformity with this principle, filing is word by word and a word is defined as one or more characters set off by spaces and/or marks of significant punctuation. It was agreed that this principle would be applied without exception to abbreviations, hyphenated words, initials and acronyms, and names with prefixes. After reaffirming its earlier decision that numbers expressed in digits or other notation would precede letters and that, with few exceptions, they would be arranged according to their numerical value, the committee agreed on specifications for the treatment of ordinal numerals, fractions, decimals, and subscript and superscript numerals.

It was emphasized that, as an aid to catalog users, liberal provision should be made for categorical references. This type of reference would briefly explain a particular filing rule, describe its effect on entries in variant forms, and point to other parts of the file where they might be found. By functioning as a general reference for a category of headings (for exam-

ple, those beginning with a numeral), a categorical reference would minimize the need for specific filing references. The committee also began its discussion of the relatively rare cases in which an element should be ignored or transposed. There was concurrence on the handling of titles of honor and terms of address but other situations will require fuller exploration before a decision is reached. [*John C. Rather*]

RTSD/ISAD/RASD IN MARBI

The interdivisional MARBI Committee held six sessions on January 18, 20, 21, 22, and the sessions began with a consideration of the role of MARBI itself as distinguished from the role of MARBI as the MARC Advisory Group. In the latter role, the committee reviews requests for changes to the LC/MARC formats, as reflected in the MARC Distribution Services, in accordance with the guidelines set forth in a paper published in the March 1, 1974 issue of the LC *Information Bulletin* pp. A-60–A-64. The Library of Congress MARC Development Office also refers other matters pertaining to machine-readable bibliographic data to the committee for review and recommendation.

The committee decided that it could receive, review, and recommend to the Library of Congress changes to the MARC format from sources other than the Library, and that proposals which the Library found acceptable should be resubmitted to MARBI through regular procedures.

The committee also discussed whether it should be concerned with machine-readable data files other than MARC. After deciding that present scope of the committee does not prohibit such concern, the group invited members to submit proposals for consideration. A task list of topics to be considered by the committee in the near future was drawn up, and procedures for responding to MARC changes proposed by the Library of Congress were reviewed. It was agreed that changes continue to be disseminated to MARC users and that comments of the committee and MARC users be returned within 30 days to the chairman, who will compile and submit them to the committee for final review before returning a yes or no recommendation to the Library within the designated 60 days.

Henriette Avram, Library of Congress, briefly described current and forthcoming matters before the committee including,

(1) Music format–final draft

(2) Authority format (names and subjects)–final draft

(3) LC's Automated Process Information File (APIF) format–for information only

(4) Map format–revision

(5) Character sets: Math symbols, African, Extended roman, Extended Cyrillic, Greek

(6) Format for Library of Congress distribution of Canadian MARC monographs

(7) Spanning technique for long records, and

(8) Projected publication date field.

Following Mrs. Avram's presentation, the committee agreed to ask MARC users whether they prefer that the Library of Congress convert the Canadian tape to the LC/MARC format or that the tape be distributed in the Canadian MARC format as received. The spanning technique was deferred in anticipation of a combined proposal for spanning and blocking. It was recommended that inclusion of the projected publication date be deferred as having low priority.

Subsequent MARBI sessions dealt chiefly with proposed changes to the MARC serials format to accommodate the needs of the CONSER Project, including the requirements of the National Library of Canada and the National Serials Data Program. The committee approved all of the recommended changes (LC/MARBI 5 through 34) with some modifications, with the exception of certain proposals that were withdrawn. The changes will be published as an addendum to *Serials: A MARC Format*, 2nd edition. While approving the changes, the committee felt that there should be some further review with respect to expansion of the format. Accordingly, the chairman appointed Charles Husbands, Harvard University, as chairman of a subcommittee. The first task of the subcommittee will be to name itself and to define its charge, subject to the approval of the MARBI Committee. [*Josephine S. Pulsifer*]

RTSD CCRC SUBCOMMITTEE FOR RULES FOR CATALOGING MACHINE-READABLE DATA FILES

The Subcommittee for Rules for Cataloging Machine-Readable Data Files met on January 18, 20, and 21. The members present were Elizabeth Herman, chairwoman; Lawrence Auld; Gerry Dobbin; Carolyn Kacena; Judith Rowe; and Henriette Avram, Library of Congress liaison. The minutes of the New York annual meeting were approved, and papers written by the various subcommittee members on the formulation of rules for size of file area, accompanying material, notes, production and distribution consider-

ations, and considerations of main and added entries were reviewed.

The subcommittee discussed the possibility of holding a special meeting before the ALA meeting in San Francisco, as the final report of the subcommittee must be submitted to the Catalog Code Revision Committee by January 1976. [*Henriette D. Avram*]

RTSD CATALOG CODE REVISION COMMITTEE

The RTSD Catalog Code Revision Committee (CCRC) held an open forum on Tuesday, January 21, to receive suggestions and recommendations from the profession on areas of the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules* (AACR) that should undergo revision. John D. Byrum, Chairman of the CCRC, opened the meeting by reviewing the provisions of the Memorandum of Agreement, the objectives of the revision effort, the timetable for the revision, and the composition of the Joint Steering Committee.

The foundation for work on the second edition was laid at a tripartite meeting of U.S., Canadian, and British representatives in March 1974. It was then decided that the new edition of the rules would be the work of five authors: the American Library Association, the Canadian Library Association, the Library Association, the British Library, and the Library of Congress. The aim would be to produce a text uniform for both North America and Great Britain. In order that anyone interested in the second edition might be aware of the maximum number of people to whom suggestions could be referred, Mr. Byrum introduced the members of CCRC: Liz J. Bishoff, Winifred E. Duncan, Neal L. Edgar, Doralyn J. Hickey, Frances Hinton, Carol F. Ishimoto, Paul B. Kebabian, Åke Koel, Edith S. Scott, and Gordon Stevenson. Work on the second edition will be guided by a Joint Steering Committee representing all five authors: Peter Lewis, representing the British Library, is chairman of the Joint Steering Committee, and other members are John Byrum (ALA representative), Phillip Escreet (Library Association representative), Jean Lunn (Canadian Committee on Cataloguing representative), and Elizabeth Tate (LC representative). Joel Dowing (British Library), G. E. Hamilton (Library Association), Frances Hinton (ALA) and Ronald Hagler or Jack Cain are alternate members of the Joint Steering Committee. The editor of the second edition is Paul W. Winkler, and Michael Gorman is associate editor.

CCRC has been divided into approximately 25 rule revision and proposal review teams, each of which will be responsible for reviewing the pertinent sections or rules of the AACR. Summaries of the activities of the CCRC will appear in each quarterly issue of *Library Resources and Technical Services.* As a point of departure for its work, CCRC has prepared an annotated bibliography of materials commenting or criticizing the AACR, and this bibliography will be made available through RTSD. Mr. Byrum than called for proposals from those in attendance, noting that the CCRC would begin to develop its recommendations for rule revision at its April meeting.

Several persons spoke of revisions to rules for government publications, advocating, in general, special rules for such publications with respect to both choice of entry and form of heading. The consensus of those speaking was that although entry under the agency is preferable, at least an added entry should be provided, that all government agencies should be entered under the appropriate jurisdiction, and that the headings for government bodies should include the full hierarchy.

Others making proposals advocated more elaborate guidance in dealing with materials for which principal responsibility is difficult to determine, clearer and simpler language and examples, a better index, and better guidance in dealing with the choice of personal or corporate authorship.

In response to a question, Mr. Byrum indicated that the revision timetable would not allow the CCRC to hold a similar open forum in San Francisco, but that comments or proposals on AACR could be sent to him: John D. Byrum, Jr., Catalogue Division, Princeton University Library, Princeton, N.J. 08540.

[*Robert M. Hiatt* and *Benny R. Tucker*]

JOINT STEERING COMMITTEE FOR REVISION OF THE AACR

The Joint Steering Committee for Revision of the AACR held two meetings concurrently with the ALA Midwinter Meeting. Members attending the sessions were Peter Lewis, Chairman; Joel Downing, Phillip Escreet, and G. E. Hamilton representing the British Library and the Library Association; Jean Lunn representing the Canadian Committee on Cataloguing; Elizabeth Tate, Library of Congress; John Byrum and Frances Hinton, ALA Catalog Code Revision Committee; Carol Kelm, Executive Secretary of RTSD; Paul Winkler, editor; and Michael Gorman, associate editor of the revision. Robert Wedgeworth, ALA Executive Director, met briefly with the committee to discuss certain details of the funding arrangements. Much of the first session on January 23 was devoted to the refinement of procedures, determination of a

timetable, and consideration of the program of work.

The second session on January 24 dedicated primarily to the important task of formulating underlying principles for this revision of the cataloging code. The members are in accord on these four basic premises:

(1) The Joint Steering Committee resolves that the second edition of the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules* will maintain general conformity with the Paris principles on which the 1967 rules are based.

(2) The Joint Steering Commitee resolves that the second edition will take particular account of developments in the machine processing of bibliographic records.

(3) The Joint Steering Committee affirms its commitment to conformity with the ISBD(M) as the basis for bibliographic description of monographs and to the principle of standardization in the bibliographic description of all categories of materials.

(4) The Joint Steering Committee accepts a commitment entered into by its predecessor to base the revision of the relevant chapters of Part III of the AACR primarily on the following four sources: *Standards for Cataloging Nonprint Materials* issued by the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (U.S.); *Nonbook Materials: the Organization of Integrated Collections* (Canada); *Non-book Materials Cataloguing Rules* (U.K.); and the forthcoming revisions of the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules,* Chapter 12 and sections of Chapter 14 of the North American Text (U.S.)."

The Committee is planning further meetings for May and October. [*Elizabeth L. Tate*]

RTSD CCS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The two midwinter meetings of the RTSD Cataloging and Classification Section's Executive Committee on January 21 and 22 devoted primarily to reports from the chairmen of the section's various committees. Carolyn McMillen announced the slate agreed upon by the Nominating Committee. Marguerite Soroka informed the group that the work of the Margaret Mann Citation Committee had been successfully completed.

Carol Ishimto described the plans of the Conference Program Committee for a one-day institute at San Francisco. This institute is being designed around the theme "International Standards as a Stepping Stone to UBC" and will treat both the application of the revised rules of description in monograph cataloging and current developments here and abroad in serial and non-book cataloging.

Phyllis Richmond notified the Executive Committee that the number of papers submitted to *Library Resources and Technical Services* in the field of cataloging had tapered off from the previous year's high to a more normal volume of 14.

Nancy Williamson reported the work of subcommittees of the Subject Analysis Committee and notified the Executive Committee that the ad hoc Subcommittee on Subject Headings for Correctional Materials, having completed its survey and made its recommendations, will shortly be dissolved. There was considerable discussion of the best organizational location for a proposed subcommittee on the subject analysis of non-book materials.

Clare Ryan, the representative to the Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee, gave a detailed report of the fall meeting of the Committee and the planning for the 19th edition. She mentioned that a Dewey Decimal Classification Liaison Committee has recently been organized in Australia.

The first session of the CCS Executive Committee concluded with a presentation by Stanley Humenuk, Western Illinois University, concerning a project undertaken by an ad hoc committee of the ACRL Slavic and East European Section.

Continuing the CCS committee reports in the second session, Winifred Duncan summarized discussion in the Cataloging of Children's Materials Committee regarding the application of Library of Congress and Sears subject headings to children's literature. She spoke of the committee's decision to communicate to the Library of Congress its conclusion that subject headings for adult fiction are desirable. Her committee will recommend also the complete reorganization of Part III of the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules* and has endorsed the use of the generic designator "sound recording" in preference to "audio recording" for the bibliographic description of audiovisual materials.

C. McMillen described the effective meshing of the work of the Descriptive Cataloging Committee with that of the new Catalog Code Revision Committee. She forwarded a recommendation of her committee that ALA Publishing Services be asked to reconsider their decision against publication of the romanization tables.

Maurice Lapierre cited four crucial issues about which the concerns of the Policy and Research Committee center. The first is the lack of empirical data available to decision makers confronted with problems like the cataloging of serials. The second is the fact that international standards for bibliographic

description are being created for various kinds of library materials independently of one another and are not based on a common paradigm as exemplified by ISBD(M). The committee considers it of the utmost importance that there be consistency among all international standards for bibliographic description so that the descriptive cataloging of materials with varying physical characteristics may be more easily integrated into common catalogs and easily interpreted. The status of the MARC format as a standard and the possibilities of sharing responsibility among OCLC participants for analyzing various microform sets were the other two concerns of the Policy and Research Committee.

In her role as representative to the RASD Catalog Use Study Committee, Karen Horny reported that work will continue on the project to study the use of the *Books: Subjects* section of the published *Library of Congress Catalog.* Although the spontaneous opinion of the members of the committee is that ISBD punctuation will not be a barrier to reader use of the catalog, the committee concluded that a study of this question might be a useful undertaking. A study on the best way to divide a catalog was suggested by a member of the CCS Executive Committee.

[*Elizabeth L. Tate*]

RASD INTERLIBRARY LOAN COMMITTEE

The Interlibrary Loan Committee (ILL) of the Reference and Adult Services Division held business meetings on January 20 and 21 with Virginia Boucher, University of Colorado Libraries, Boulder, presiding. Mrs. Boucher opened the first by reading the text of a letter she had been instructed by the committee to write supporting the concept of "fair use" of copyrighted materials and then named the various ALA officials to which it had been sent. The chairman announced that a panel on the "Accessibility of Local History and Genealogical Materials" had been scheduled for the 1975 Annual Conference in San Francisco by RASD's History Section. The interlibrary loan of genealogical materials has been the subject of much discussion between ILL and the History Section's Genealogy Committee in recent years because of the restrictive provisions of the National Interlibrary Loan Code, 1968. This writer presented a brief report on the National Union Catalog reference service and called attention to the detailed information on LC's book catalogs and related subjects in the "Semiannual Report on Developments at the Library of Congress" appended to the January 10 issue of the LC *Information Bulletin.*

Imre Jarmy of the Catalog Publication Division, Library of Congress, described the progress on the next edition *Symbols of American Libraries.* Completion of this computer-produced compilation awaits final programming work. No publication date has been set, but it is hoped it will be available in the summer of 1975. Joseph Nitecki, Editor of the *Directory of Library Reprographic Services,* reported that much of the work on the next (sixth) edition has been completed. This is expected to be published during the first quarter of 1976. Mr. Nitecki requested feedback from interlibrary loan librarians on the format of the sixth edition in order to prepare for the seventh edition, projected for 1978. The desirability of ensuring that this directory and the new manual on ILL policies not be duplicative was recognized.

Sarah K. Thomson, Librarian of the Bergen Community College, Paramus, N.J., who compiled the *Interlibrary Loan Policies Directory,* reported that it was nearly ready, and committee members were pleasantly surprised the next day to be shown the volume and told that it was available from ALA for $7.95.

For the first time, the committee met with a representative from the Medical Library Association. Vern M. Pings, director of the Wayne State University Library, Detroit, provided much useful information on the interaction of the medical library network with non-medical library users. Because of the importance of the topic, he was asked if he would assist in arranging to have a speaker from the medical library community at the 1975 Annual Conference. With positive word from him on January 21 about a speaker, the committee agreed that the second ILL meeting at San Francisco be devoted to interlibrary cooperation among medical and non-medical libraries.

As a result of a discussion of the relevant portion of the 1975 draft revision of "Standards for College Libraries," the committee recommended that the language in the standards be clarified in terms of interlibrary loan. The committee agreed to ask for time for a program session at the Centennial ALA Annual Conference in Chicago, 1976. A possible subject might be the interlibrary systems emerging in the country. The committee also agreed to accept the Mexican version of the ILL form with one minor change in the Spanish terminology. For the San Francisco conference, members were asked to examine the statement on the committee's purpose and makeup.

On the matter of unusual language collections, committee members agreed on the desirability of having an organization such as the Public Library

Association or the Association of State Library Agencies compile a directory of libraries with such collections that can be made available on interlibrary loan for general reading. Reference was made to the November 1974 meeting of the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA) in Washington, particularly the meeting of the Committee on International Lending and Union Catalogues. The idea of affirming the IFLA committee's resolution urging that all international loans be sent and returned by air mail with the borrower paying the shipping costs was not acted upon at this session because it was felt that few libraries were sufficiently acquainted with international lending.

A special subcommittee of ILL that had been asked to consider clarifications of the National Interlibrary Loan Code of 1968, particularly with regard to undergraduate loans, presented a draft revision of the introduction to the code and proposals for brief revisions of two other sections. The discussion centered on whether this was only a clarification or a call for outright revision that would be a lengthy process. The upshot was an agreement to circulate the revised introduction to the organizations that approved the 1968 code plus other appropriate agencies such as the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, asking whether this revised introduction would be considered as an acceptable clarification. As a final item of business, David C. Weber, director of the Stanford University Libraries and representative to ILL from the Association of Research Libraries, reported on the current situation regarding the *Study on a System for Interlibrary Communication* (SILC) prepared for ARL by Robert M. Hayes of Becker and Hayes. The matter is still in a very fluid state, but detailed consideration of SILC was undertaken during the ARL meetings in Chicago, and there was agreement on the concept of computer-based interlibrary communications and on options for establishing such a system. *[Robert W. Schaaf]*

ACRL ASIAN AND AFRICAN SECTION EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Executive Committee, at its January 20 meeting, heard plans for the San Francisco program meeting, which the section will sponsor jointly with the ACRL Art Section. A lecture at the de Young Museum will precede tours of the museum's African collection and Avery Brundage Oriental Collection, followed by lunch in Golden Gate Park.

The committee discussed at length the goals and objectives of the section and ways in which activities might be coordinated with groups sharing similar interests. Invitations to attend the section's Executive Committee meetings have been unproductive and the committee agreed that efforts should now turn to the appointment of representatives of the section to attend meetings of other groups in order to establish ties, coordinate efforts where possible, and/or report back to the committee on activities of concern to the section. The intent is to extend this effort beyond ALA to groups such as Middle East Librarians Association, the African Studies Association, and the Committee on South Asian Libraries and Documentation.

The Chairman of the committee, Henry Scholberg, presented a revised draft of his Directory of Asian and African Librarians in North America, requesting additions and corrections. He hopes to make this directory available to section members at the 1975 Annual Conference of ALA. *[Frank M. McGowan]*

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE

The ALA International Relations Committee (IRC) met twice on January 20 and once on January 21. The principal topics discussed were the future direction of ALA's international responsibilities and the particular role and function of the IRC within the ALA structure. The committee was especially concerned with the implementation of recommendations made in a January 25, 1974, report to the ALA Council by an Ad Hoc Committee to Study International Responsibilities. The principal recommendation in the report, the appointment of a full-time coordinator of international relations in the ALA headquarters, was strongly endorsed by the IRC. Chairman Norman Horrocks will present a budget request for the full $33,500 recommended by the committee for the coordinating activity. In general, the IRC felt that appointment of a full-time coordinator was imperative if ALA's international relations program was to be truly effective.

In addition to budget matters, the IRC approved a resolution, sponsored jointly with the Intellectual Freedom Committee, protesting recent UNESCO sanctions against Israel and urging restoration of U.S. funds for UNESCO itself; agreed to consider developing a formal structure for selecting delegates and observers to represent ALA and the United States at international library meetings; and decided to explore the possibility of creating, as an IRC sub-unit, a liaison committee for Canadian libraries.

Robert B. Stevens, Chairman of the IRC Advisory Committee on Liaison with Japanese Libraries, outlined plans for the third Japan-U.S. Conference on

Libraries and Information Science in Higher Education, to be held in Kyoto in October 1975. Several reports were made by other ALA units with international activities. Mr. Horrocks announced that in the future ALA groups reporting to IRC should submit written reports in advance of the committee meeting. [*John Y. Cole*]

RTSD RS POLICY AND RESEARCH COMMITTEE

The Policy and Research Committee of the Resources Section of the Resources and Technical Services Division met on Tuesday morning, January 21, under the chairmanship of Deanna H. Marcum, Tennessee Joint University Libraries, Nashville. A major item on the agenda was the discussion of the mechanics for implementing a proposed scholarship fund for deserving library students. This matter had already been discussed at a previous meeting of the committee, but the complex nature of the proposal has prevented an early solution of the problems involved. It is hoped that a final solution will be reached at the next annual meeting in San Francisco. Utilization for committee work of members-at-large was also discussed. Finally, the committee addressed itself to the need of setting up a system for the exchange of information concerning the formation and activities of consortia and resource-sharing library groups.

[*John Charles Finzi*]

RASD BIBLIOGRAPHY COMMITTEE

The Bibliography Committee of the Reference and Adult Services Division met on Monday evening, January 20, under the chairmanship of Daniel O. O'Connor, Graduate School of Library Services, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J. A review of the objectives, goals, and function of the committee, together with a reporting on projects currently underway, formed a major area of discussion. The chairman emphasized the importance of specific bibliographic research projects that the committee should undertake or sponsor. Edmund Arnold, Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Iowa, reported on committee liaison and coordination efforts during the past few years, the thrust of his statement being that the committee should review and work toward a consolidation of goals and vote on them at the 1975 ALA Annual Conference in San Francisco. He agreed to prepare a statement on committee goals to be circulated in draft form to committee members by the end of February. Considerable discussion also centered on the request from the RASD Executive Secretary for a statement from the Bibliography Committee on the proposed national newspaper survey sponsored by the Organization of American Historians now being considered by the National Endowment for the Humanities. Project Director Gale E. Peterson was present at the meeting and commented on the proposal. After lengthy discussion, committee members decided not to take a position on this matter at this time since they had not received copies of the proposal sufficiently in advance for evaluation. In the future, the committee would like to receive copies of any such proposals for evaluation in order to make recommendations to the Board. Elizabeth Futas, Graduate School of Library Service, Rutgers University, delivered the findings of a paper she had recently written that related to national and trade bibliographic coverage. The results of this research indicated serious time-lag problems for CBI, which included only 25 percent of the sample studied. This report, coupled with other statements, seemed to indicate a slippage in bibliographic coverage and a further deterioration of bibliographic control since earlier studies. These reports also underlined the importance of these specific bibliographic research studies as samples of projects the Bibliography Committee should sponsor. It was agreed that the proposals for bibliographic research distributed to committee members will be reported and discussed at the San Francisco meeting. Also to be discussed will be the possibility of the Bibliography Committee sponsoring a program at the 1976 Midwinter Meeting. [*John Charles Finzi*]